

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

**Georgiana M. P.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**CIV NO. 1:25-cv-00057-KRS**

**FRANK BISIGNANO,  
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,**

**Defendant.**

**ORDER FOR EXTENSION**

THIS MATTER coming before the Court upon Defendant's First Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time<sup>1</sup> (the "Motion"), (Docs. 16, 17), it being stated that Plaintiff concurs in the granting of the Motion, and the Court having read the Motion and being fully advised hereby **GRANTS** the Motion.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendant file his Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint no later than **August 18, 2025**. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff may file a reply, if any, fourteen (14) days after Defendant files his brief.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KEVIN R. SWEAZEA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant filed two identical Unopposed Motions for Extension of Time on July 10, 2025, although the documents were titled differently in CM/ECF. Doc. 16 is titled an Unopposed Motion to Remand and Doc. 17 is titled an Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply as to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand. *See* (Docs. 16, 17). For purposes of this Order, the Court clarifies that it is not granting unopposed remand despite the CM/ECF title of Doc. 16. The Court concludes Doc. 16 is not only duplicative of Doc. 17, but the CM/ECF title is incorrect. The Court thus finds Doc. 16 is **denied as moot**.